Unifying Rural Community Interests

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below

JAN 5 1925

MAR 30 1925

JUN 14 1930

JAN 26 1931

APR 13 1931

MAY 19 1932

NOV 18 1932

APR 3 1933

OCT 12 1933

FEB 5 1936

JUN 12 1936

JUL 29 1939

JUN 9 1947

NOV 10 1961

DEC 4 1961

RECD LD-URL

APR 27 1970

APR 19 1970

Form L-9–15*m*-8,'24

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/unifyingruralcom00israiala

90
Jones

UNIFYING RURAL COMMUNITY INTERESTS

EDITED BY
HENRY ISRAEL
Editor "Rural Manhood."

Association Press
NEW YORK: 124 EAST 28TH STREET
LONDON: 47 PATERNOSTER ROW, E. C.
1914

39824
N 2 '17

Copyright, 1914, by the
International Committee of Young Men's
Christian Associations

BV
1210
I85

CC 9-8-28

INTRODUCTION

This conference has come to be almost a necessity. Four years ago we brought together representatives of various interstate agencies—something like one hundred people—to exchange ideas. It was the first meeting of its kind and we have since noted with great satisfaction the continuous welding together of feeling and vital interest. That distrust, suspicion and even antagonism which was so evident in the first meeting will not appear today. Of that I am certain, for we believe in each other and we understand that nobody here has any axe to grind. It is a great joy to those of us who are giving our lives to work in the country that the individualistic spirit is disappearing and the country people and institutions are rapidly feeling that they must get together if the country is ever to come to its own.

A new note has also been struck with regard to the relationship of the country to the city. We are now coming to appreciate and practice a gospel of interdependence.

We are coming to realize that the city cannot exist without the country, nor the country without the city; that there is a working relationship, and we are keenly anxious to find out what that relationship ought to be. We are hoping that as a direct result of this meeting we shall learn wherein the institutions that are represented here may all work together for a better and more adequate country life.

It was interesting to note in the people who composed the country life commission which visited Europe this summer—one hundred of them, roundly speaking—that each felt that he had the panacea for all ills of country life. We paid the price of democracy to coordinate those ideas, and it was a great joy and satisfaction to see that chaotic mind of the crowd molded into a mind of working unity, to see one hundred people going out with scattered ideas and coming back to be not only advocates, but apostles of a great underlying idea and motive. This Conference is planned with such an end in view.

Now in these days of efficiency we want to know where and how the Rural Depart-

ment of the Young Men's Christian Association can work to advantage with the church, the home and the school—those institutions which are established and are fundamental and eternal. If we are doing some things we ought not to do, it is because we have not had the friendly counsel and advice of other agencies to such a degree as to show us the error of our ways. We are hoping today to face some things very squarely. Four years ago we could not do it. We said very little about the Young Men's Christian Association at that time. Some of us believe that the Rural Young Men's Christian Association is built not alone on quantitative lines, but on qualitative lines—a permeating and coordinating agency helping the church, the home and the school in doing each its specific work. One of the objects of the conference is to discover the views of representatives of other agencies for rural betterment. We hope that Doctor Carver will tell us something of the methods of the Department of Agriculture. It seems to me, if I read the signs of the times aright, that there is a growing conviction in the minds of our economic and political leaders that along with economic

prosperity in the country there must be a corresponding increase or consciousness of social, moral and spiritual prosperity. And we shall have the privilege today of listening to some of these leaders.

ALBERT E. ROBERTS.

CONTENTS

PAGE

Introduction. Albert E. Roberts, Secretary of the County Work Department of the International Committee 3

I

The Department of Agriculture and Country Life. Thomas N. Carver, Ph. D., United States Department of Agriculture . . . 9

II

The Point of Emphasis in the New Rural School Idea. A. C. Monahan, Deputy Commissioner of the United States Bureau of Education 18

III

The United States Rural Organization Service. Thomas N. Carver, Ph. D., United States Department of Agriculture 43

IV

The Country Church and the Young Men's Christian Association. Prof. G. Walter Fiske, Junior Dean of Oberlin Theological Seminary 55

V

PAGE

The Place of the Young Men's Christian Association in the New Rural Awakening. Kenyon L. Butterfield, President of Massachusetts Agricultural College 71

THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND COUNTRY LIFE

Dr. Thomas N. Carver
United States Department of Agriculture

I wish to say something about the enlarged conception of the function of the Department of Agriculture which has been growing in the last few years, and particularly perhaps in the last few months. The movement itself dates back several years. Take the idea of teaching by demonstration in agriculture. A revolution has taken place not so very unlike that which took place in our college laboratories a generation or so ago. There was a time when laboratory experiments were conducted by the professor while the students looked on; probably they learned something by that method. That, however, has been displaced by another method in which the students perform the experiments while the professor looks on, or at least gives direction.

Now the idea of farm demonstration and of agricultural experimentation has gone through a similar development. A demonstration farm or an experiment station—I wish to qualify here very closely—I do not mean to discuss the investigational side of the experiment station. That, of course, is its chief function, but there has been mixed with the experiment station idea a certain amount of demonstration for the education of the surrounding country where men come in and see what is going on. They learn something that way, but they do not learn as much by that method as they do when the farmer himself is made to carry on the experiment under the direction and supervision of the expert.

The change from the method where the expert performs the experiment while the student or farmer looks on, to the method where the farmer himself carries on the experiment or demonstration under the direction and supervision of an agricultural expert, is a most important change. This work has so enlarged and has so taken hold of the people, especially in the Southern States, that I do not hesitate to say that it is the most beneficent work for rural improve-

ment now going on anywhere. There is no organization here or abroad, so far as I have studied them, that compares with it in efficiency in getting actual results.

In the second place the idea that the business of farming consists merely in growing crops has undergone some change recently. That is, the business side of farming is growing in importance. Of course in one sense all farming is business—but technically we restrict the word "business" to buying and selling. The buying and selling side, which is a very important part of the farmer's work, has not been greatly emphasized in the past, but is coming to be so at the present time by the Department of Agriculture and many other agencies. Of course, no organization, no department ever does a thing alone. It is in the air. Movements are started anywhere, all inspired by the same general idea. One can say at least that the Department of Agriculture is awake to this movement and is taking measures to participate in it and contribute to its development.

In the third place, the change does not end with the business side of agriculture. It is even conceived to be the proper function of a National Department of Agriculture to

consider the question of better living. Now these are not water-tight compartments. One is dependent upon the other. You cannot have better business beyond a certain point without some improvement in living conditions. For example: We used to persuade ourselves that all that was necessary to keep the young men on the farm was to make farming profitable and increase the farmer's income; but we discover that just the opposite of that is true. That is to say, farmers are leaving the farm most rapidly where farming is most prosperous. This is borne out absolutely by statistical evidence. Wherever in this country farming is very prosperous and farm land has risen in price, there you find the largest percentage of retired farmers living in the towns. I know of no earthly power that can preserve a country from ruin and decay if absentee landlordism prevails.

Now the reason these men retire and go to the town is because they can afford to. If they could not afford to live in the town they would stay on the farm; but if the land becomes valuable enough through good farming and good marketing conditions to enable a man to live on the rent of his land, he will go to the town and live on that rent unless

the living conditions in the country are such as to hold him. The problem of country life is not solved when you have made the farmer prosperous. The next thing, the important thing, is to make country life so attractive that farmers will stay on the farms even though they can afford to live in the town. Until that problem is solved the country life problem is not solved at all. It is even conceived to be a proper function of the Department of Agriculture to contribute its share to the solution of that problem of country living.

Discussion

Dr. J. H. Dillard.

It seems to me that a key note for the fundamental proposition in all improvement of country life is the question of the tenant. I believe that more young men leave the country, leave the farm, and go to the cities because of the fact that they cannot readily secure land of their own than for any other reason whatsoever, and our country is not showing any improvement in that respect. If we could find some way by which there could be a better distribution of the land in the open country we would be going into the

heart of the whole matter of country improvement. In the South I see the evils more particularly. I see a tremendous growth in land values. I heard a conservative estimate made not long ago that the farm lands had at least trebled in the last ten years. Now we need money badly for better school houses and for better salaries for teachers and for better roads, and yet we cannot get our assessors to increase the assessments. Efforts have been made in some places to show that if there were an increase of assessments to even one-third of the value of the land we would have more money for these good purposes. If all who are trying to improve country life could unite in a campaign for fairer assessments of land values we would solve the problem of getting more money for our country improvements, and at the same time induce those who are holding land out of use to part with the land to those who would use it. There can be no prosperous country life until the people who till the soil hold the soil.

Dr. Warren H. Wilson.

I was unconvinced, from what Professor Carver said, that an income was needed and

had been lacking, but he went on immediately to say that we find the farmer with a high value for his land, as if the two were identical. Now in the church we find just what Dr. Dillard has said, a retarded willingness of the farmer to contribute to social improvements. My own study leads me to believe that the farmer has not the income that Dr. Carver implies he has. . . . . I look for Dr. Carver's work in the Department of Agriculture to contribute to our churches, schools, Young Men's Christian Association and others in the country a better understanding of the farmers' income situation and a great addition so far as the Government can bring it about, an addition that will be independent of increased land values. I think the present increased land value diminishes the farmers' income.

Dr. Carver.

I grant that Dr. Wilson's point is very well taken. When I spoke of the farmer my idea did shift from one man to the other. I was thinking of the original farmer whom we knew twenty or thirty years ago who is now retired. He retired largely because his income from his farm operations was large.

Rent is high. That is, a piece of land from which you can make a large income will sell or will rent for a high price. In the next stage comes the condition which Dr. Wilson has mentioned. The owner has moved to the town, the farmer is now a tenant. His income is not so very large. It is not as much perhaps as he thinks it is, or as some people might be led to infer from his remarks, for the man who can afford to rent a high-priced piece of land is generally the man who can handle that land successfully and make a fairly good income. But under the absentee landlord system the land owner loses his interest in the locality and does not want his taxes put up. The tenant does not expect to stay there very long. He has no interest in building up the community. He may have a temporary one, but not the same interest that a resident farm owner would have. There you have the situation which Dr. Wilson had in mind. The owner of high-priced land is living in the town and, therefore, is unwilling to contribute to the church and the school in the country. The tenant has no permanent interest in the community, therefore is unwilling to contribute. In the best farming districts of this country

in many cases you will find the poorest schools and churches.

Dr. Dillard.

Take, for example, the sugar plantations of Louisiana. There are few schools of any account in the parishes where these plantations are situated. There are eleven parishes in Louisiana, where the greatest plantations are located, in which the illiteracy of the white males over twenty-one is 42 per cent.

Dr. Carver.

You cannot take up one problem without a dozen others sticking to it. This question of tenancy is very acute and is one of the fundamental questions. At the same time, suppose we could put some beneficent scheme into effect to enable all these farm tenants to become owners—whereby after fifteen or twenty years of good work and good business they might own this high-priced land. Still, if the town furnishes them what they want, and the country does not, they will move to town and leave that land to new tenants and the same thing would have to be gone over again.

THE POINT OF EMPHASIS IN THE NEW RURAL SCHOOL IDEA

A. C. MONAHAN
Deputy Commissioner United States Bureau of Education

The point of emphasis in the new rural school idea is a better rural school, a rural school which will provide for the country children the opportunity for the good education that our best city schools provide for city children. We know the situation—especially you who have been in country work. The rural school is very much behind in the educational procession. Country children have not the opportunities for schooling that city children have. The country school, in buildings, equipment, sanitary arrangement, and in management and supervision and practically everything else that goes toward making a good school, is far behind the average city school. This is more generally true in the West and South, but scattered about in the eastern section of the country

we have some of the very poorest rural schools in the United States. This week I visited some rural schools in New England and found one or two that are nearly as poor as any school I have ever seen elsewhere. The point of emphasis then is equal educational opportunities for the country child and the city child.

The condition of our rural schools is reflected by two facts brought out in the last census. The rate of illiteracy among the rural population in the United States is greater than among the urban population; in fact, it is twice as great. The rural illiteracy is 10.1 per cent, the urban, 5.1 per cent. The rural rate of illiteracy is greater than the urban rate in more than two-thirds of the states. The states where the urban illiteracy is greater are the states in which the immigrants are settling, 75 per cent of whom, according to the census, are settling in cities. The greatest percentage of illiteracy is among this class, but in spite of that and in spite of the fact that they are seeking the cities, the rural illiteracy for the country as a whole is twice as great as the urban. The other fact in regard to the rural illiteracy, due in large measure to the fact that we have

poor rural schools, is that among the *native-born children* in the United States, the rate of illiteracy among those born of *native parents* is more than three times as great as among those born of *foreign parents*. The figures are these: the rate of illiteracy among native children born of native parents is 3.7 per cent, and among native children born of foreign parents is 1.1 per cent. This is due, in part at least, to the fact that a large proportion of the children born of foreign parents are in cities, and in the cities good school facilities are provided and they can get an education. These are two of the serious indications that our rural schools are backward compared with the rest of our educational system. We must judge the efficiency of a school by the amount of illiteracy which it leaves about it.

The Bureau of Education is in sympathy with the rural work the Young Men's Christian Association is doing in the country because we appreciate that good rural schools cannot come without an agitation for better educational facilities, and that the movement for better educational facilities is but a part of the greater movement for better rural conditions of every sort. Economic condi-

tions, social conditions, and educational conditions improve together, as a rule, or do not improve at all. There are many instances in the country where you may find good rural schools in communities that are not prosperous, even where the schools are depending largely on local funds for support, and there are a few instances where you may find good schools where the standard of morals is low. They are the exceptions, not the rule. Investigation proves that better schools come with improved economic and social conditions, and, therefore, in working for better schools we must work for general rural improvement.

The place where the Young Men's Christian Association can help in the better rural school idea is in helping to build up the sentiment for education. There is needed among all people the creation of deep conviction of the value of education. It is lacking in large measure. Every investigation that has been made with which I am familiar brings out the fact that school children leave school for lack of interest more than for all other reasons put together. An investigation in the city of Worcester, Massachusetts, made recently among a thousand girls between the

ages of fourteen and sixteen and employed in mercantile and manufacturing establishments, brought out the fact that 55 per cent of these girls came from homes of intelligence and of comfort, and they left school without economic pressure. The investigators conclude that more than 60 per cent of the boys and girls of all ages employed in the city left school without being forced to do so because they had to help support the family. Other investigators in other cities arrive at the same conclusion. In certain states compulsory education has been opposed because it has been thought that the wages of the children were necessary to help support the family. Investigation shows, however, that children do not leave because of economic pressure as often as because of lack of interest in school work. It is really a lack of appreciation of the value of education; and the great work to be done first in rural United States is to build up where it does not exist a sentiment for education which will keep the children in school in spite of poverty and other things that may work against them in getting an education. It is in this that the Young Men's Christian Association can help.

Certain things are essential. We cannot have good country schools unless we have a proper organization for the administration of rural school affairs. In more than half of the states of the Union we still have the old district organization, in which one school and the territory it serves is a school unit, with trustees who hire the teachers, manage the school, and have complete charge of the work. Under that form of organization progress is necessarily very slow. We have in other states the township organization; in other states the county organization. It seems to most persons who have been studying the matter in a broad way that before any great progress can take place, the schools of the country must be organized on a county basis. The township unit is satisfactory in New England, for in New England there are no independent city or town or village districts. For the rest of the country it seems as though the county organization is the most satisfactory. Eleven states are organized on that basis now, and we have been helping in the Bureau of Education other states who are proposing to adopt the county unit. During the past year, in five states bills were presented before the legislatures, proposing

the county system. In four out of the five states the measure failed. It failed in the state of Ohio on account of an investigation being conducted by a state commission appointed to study school conditions. It was thought wise to pass no educational legislation until the work of the commission was finished. In the other states the bill failed for lack of information. One senator who opposed the bill in a certain state has since said he would not have opposed the measure if he had known what was being proposed. He suggests that the legislatures, the teachers, and the public must be given more information with regard to what the county organization means. The united action of all rural workers is needed to carry out this campaign of information.

The second thing that is necessary for good rural schools is supervision. The great mass of rural teachers in the United States are working without any supervision. They are untrained in the beginning and are therefore in particular need of supervision. In most states outside of New England, county superintendents are employed. In very few instances, however, are any assistants employed. It is a physical impossibility for the

county superintendent alone to supervise the schools of the average county in any efficient way. Few rural people appreciate the need of supervising officers. All cities employ professional school superintendents and city people have come to realize the necessity for their employment. Country people must be educated to the necessity of employing expert supervisors and in this campaign of education all rural workers can help.

Again, there is the question of teachers. Trained teachers are needed in country schools as well as in city schools. The wonderful development of the city school systems in the United States has in a certain way retarded the development of the country schools, because the cities have drawn from the country the trained and the best natural teachers. The great majority of teachers in the country who intend to make teaching their life work look forward toward city positions. Provisions must be made for training more teachers and for giving special training for country work. Very few rural people, even rural school trustees, appreciate that teaching is a profession and requires training. In this all forces can join to create the sentiment necessary to provide facilities for training

teachers. In the last year in the United States there were over 550,000 teachers in public school work. From normal schools and from departments of education in high schools, universities and colleges, about 27,000 persons were graduated from teachers' training courses. The average length of service of a school teacher is approximately five years, so there is one-fifth of 550,000, or 110,000 new teachers required each year, and for those vacancies there are 27,000 graduates. The movement for special courses for training rural teachers has been on the increase, but not much real work has been done. The normal schools throughout the country are offering courses in rural education for rural teachers but are not succeeding in getting many teachers in the rural courses; the city schools are taking all their graduates. Other institutions for training teachers for our rural schools have got to be found for the immediate need. New York is doing it through teacher-training courses in connection with ninety-four high schools. Minnesota and Michigan are doing the same. Eleven other states have professional courses in preparation for teaching as a part of the regular work in

high schools. As soon as a deeper appreciation is created of the need of professional training, other states will establish institutions to prepare rural teachers.

Discussion

Dr. E. H. Sneath.

I would like to ask Mr. Monahan if facilities are provided for the proper training of these rural teachers. Do economic reasons interfere with getting efficient teachers? In other words, do low salaries prevent securing well-trained teachers for the schools?

Mr. Monahan.

To a certain extent of course. In Wisconsin there is an attendance of about 1,500 students in county training schools. In the thirteen states where training courses for rural teachers are maintained in high schools or in connection with high schools, there are nearly 9,000 students in the teacher-training courses. New York State has more than 5,000 graduates of the teacher-training courses maintained in connection with ninety-four high schools now teaching in the rural schools of the state. So that these institu-

tions seem to have a large enrollment in spite of the fact that the salaries paid rural teachers are low.

Dr. Sneath.

What do you call a low salary?

Mr. Monahan.

Teachers in one-room rural schools are working for from $20 to $80 per month for the school year, which in some cases is as short as four months each, and in others as long as nine months. I do not know of any who are getting less than $20 a month. The average salary for such teachers, as far as the Bureau of Education was able to obtain data in 1910, was approximately $44 per month, or $317 per year. This is about $12 per month, or $126 per year less than is paid the average teacher, both urban and rural, in the United States.

Mr. John R. Howard.

I would like to ask Mr. Monahan if the training course as developed in Wisconsin is to his mind the best type of teacher-training course so far developed?

Mr. Monahan.

I cannot say that the Wisconsin County Training School is absolutely the very best type for training rural teachers. Rural teachers are being trained in the United States in teacher-training courses in high schools or in connection with high schools, in these county training schools of Wisconsin and in a few others in other parts of the country, and in special courses in normal schools. The Wisconsin institutions, I think, as a whole are doing better work than is being done in the states that have teacher-training courses in connection with high schools, because the whole spirit and atmosphere of these institutions is training for rural school work. The Wisconsin State Inspector of Rural Schools has made, during the past year, a very close study of the work of the graduates of the county-training schools as public school teachers. He finds their work to be much superior as a whole to that of other teachers in the state who are high school graduates, but without professional training. You understand that in Wisconsin a boy or a girl may enter these training schools and take the two years course which they give, with-

out having had any high school education. It is hardly fair to compare the graduates of the Wisconsin schools with the graduates of the New York teacher-training courses held in connection with high schools. The majority of the students in the New York courses have completed at least three years of high school work, and very many of them four years, before taking the professional courses. Some of the State Normal schools are offering special courses in rural education and are doing excellent work in training rural teachers. The school at Athens, Georgia, through an organization known as the "Georgia Club," has succeeded in interesting its students in the study of the State of Georgia and has awakened in them a wonderful interest in country work. These boys and girls are going out into the country and are making the best kind of country teachers. They see the school in its proper relation to the community and appreciate the things that the school should do better than the great majority of teachers.

Mr. C. F. Hosmer.

Mr. Monahan suggests county organization for all but the New England states.

What shall we do in New England? Why is the township unit a success in New England and not in other states?

Mr. Monahan.

The township unit is successful in New England for several reasons that would not apply elsewhere. First, the country is more densely populated, at least in all but the northern part; second, cities and towns are not independent school districts but are parts of the townships within which they are located. In all other states of the Union, except Delaware, Maryland, Florida and Louisiana, cities and towns are independent school districts. The township is too small and contains too few people, therefore, to make an efficient unit. Again, in New England the town or township is as a rule the unit of taxation, while in most of the other states the county is the unit. In the twelve states now organized on the county basis, the plan seems to be working out very well indeed. The plan now in operation in all New England, for the sparsely settled portions, is satisfactory under New England conditions. This is the plan of forming union

supervisory districts, i.e., two or more towns are united in employing a superintendent.

Dr. Sneath.

Do you find cooperation rather than jealousy on the part of the regular normal schools in the states where other institutions are provided for training teachers?

Mr. Monahan.

I think on the whole the attitude is one of cooperation.

Mr. W. J. Campbell.

What is the basis of supply or training for the new type of supervision? What about supervision?

Mr. Monahan.

There are at the present time very few institutions, if any, in the United States, that are training supervisors especially for rural work. Many teachers' colleges are giving special work for city superintendents in their regular courses. Several state normal schools, state universities and agricultural colleges are giving summer courses especially for rural superintendents. These courses are necessarily but from one to six weeks in

length. For some time to come, our rural supervisors will have to be selected from among the successful country teachers, and they will have to train themselves for their work while in service. That is what was done in securing the great majority of city superintendents. Comparatively few of them had had any special training in the distinctive work of the superintendent or the supervisor.

Dr. J. M. Thomas.

Having in mind New England conditions and the possible effect of the consolidation of schools on the boys leaving the farm and the maintenance of rural life, I would like to invite Mr. Monahan to Vermont to show him what we are doing there. He implied that the sentiment was in favor of the consolidation of rural schools.

Mr. Monahan.

The movement for consolidation of rural schools began in Massachusetts in 1875, and has extended further in that state than in any other. I think in Massachusetts a mistake was made in locating the consolidated schools in the towns and villages. It has had

the effect of drawing in the population from the outlying territory, particularly in the hilly parts of the state. The consolidated schools being established at the present time in other states are, as a rule, being located in the open country and are distinctively rural schools, not city schools located outside of the city. In many of these schools very fine work in agriculture, domestic science and other country life subjects is being conducted, even in the elementary departments. Their graduates remain on the farm and do not drift off into city work as the great majority of boys and girls do who are sent from the country into city or town schools to be educated. Education for country life, it seems to me, will come through these consolidated schools rather than through special agricultural schools.

Dr. Dillard.

We must have places in which teachers can be trained for rural work and in institutions that do not lead them away from the places they are preparing to serve. The Young Men's Christian Association and all organizations can help to develop the sentiment in favor of such training schools for

the counties. People hesitate to establish schools for training teachers. They do not realize that teaching is a profession and that the teacher must be trained for his or her work. They think if they have good ordinary schools and high schools there ought to be no lack of a supply of teachers for the country districts, but a special course is needed in the rural high schools.

There is another way in which the Young Men's Christian Association can help country improvement. This whole movement for better education is coming with a general improvement. There are now in a great many counties in the United States, county organizations for county improvement. In the Southern States they are often called school improvement leagues. It means that there is a united body that is working for better things in the county as a whole. The Young Men's Christian Association can be closely united with such work. There is need of help to increase the facilities for play in the schools, for larger grounds, better school houses and better sanitation. It is good to unite the forces which are all working for rural improvement. In the support of the

rural schools, we will make our greatest progress.

Dr. Edwin L. Earp.

Among the problems that unite us is the one that gets us back to a fundamental of this conference, and that is—Where does the County Work Department come in, in helping to solve them? I can see, in both of these splendid presentations of two phases of the rural life movement, why the question of *rural leadership* is so tremendously important. Now this is one of the biggest problems that we have to face. I come from a state that is next door to Dr. Dillard. I was talking the other day to a man from Tennessee about some of the problems of our modern social movement in reference to better living in the open country and in the cities; he said it was true that they stood for these things down there, but they vote the Democratic ticket. I saw there a conservatism in adopting such things as have been stated here. It is simply a question of leadership that is daring enough to propose those things within its own constituency. I come to speak from the point of what the church can do, and what the County Work Depart-

ment can do, in the development of leadership daring enough to suggest the things that will strike at the heart of this problem.

I was very much interested in what Mr. Monahan said about the disparity between the number of available trained teachers and the demand for them—an annual demand for 110,000 and only 27,000 available. Who is to train the 83,000? The County Work Department has a splendid work in bringing to the attention of the public this: that the teachers coming from the schools of the open country get a conception of their work in the country as a life vocation, and be given a training that shall fit them for it. As it is now in too many cases, the rural school is but a stepping-stone, the means by which the teacher may obtain the money needed to secure a normal course, where the training is away from the open country, and the ambition a position in a city school. I trust this note will be emphasized here today, of the splendid work that has been done by every institution that is helping to solve the problem of rural leadership at its source and direct it back to the place where it is needed most. Now so far as the salaries are concerned, I have a good illustration in the

Newark Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. There is a man who is a graduate of Drew Theological Seminary. He was sent to an open country church in New Jersey. He came to the Conference having doubled his membership in one year and having doubled his salary. He made himself so valuable that the farmers doubled his salary, and the farmers liked him so much that they came to church. When those farmers discovered that their preacher was going to be taken away from them for a city appointment, and he was about booked for that transfer, twelve of them got up at two o'clock in the morning, went down to the seat of the Conference and waited on the Bishop, the appointing power, and said, "We will give him a salary equal to what he is going to get in this suburban town." He is back on the job this year, and so I think the farmers are willing to pay for about what they get, and when we get rural preachers, whether they are trained in the theological school or not, if they are trained for the country the farmers will support them. I hope something will strike those fellows in these rich rural districts to suggest some of

the splendid things that have been mentioned about the taxing of land values.

Mr. Howard.

I want to return to Dr. Wilson's point again and to Dr. Carver's discussion of it, because I do not think we have just the light that we need. Dr. Carver began by saying that income had been lacking with which to build up rural social institutions, but that today in the West the farmer has high values for his land. To this implication that high land values mean greater income Dr. Wilson took exception, and declared—as he has elsewhere—that his own study led him to believe that the very fact that the valuation of land was high rendered the apparent high income not an actual income. In commenting on this, Dr. Carver made the statement, that, "a piece of land from which you can make a large income will sell for a high price." On the face of it, it would not seem possible that income could cause the price of land to rise to such an extent that that income would not be a fair return on the valuation. I think the basic question is this—what caused the present value of land, and I wish Dr. Carver would give us light on that question. Either

it was something outside the income which the farmers earn, or else the case is not such as Dr. Wilson thinks it is; namely, that the farmers cannot afford to hold the land because it is impossible to earn a fair return on the valuation.

Dr. Wilson.

This summer Professor Warren, of Ithaca, brought out the question of income in this state, and in answer to the question he said that in the State of New York, in average counties, the farmer can not afford to pay a preacher more than $500 a year, with a house, because that is all he can pay himself. He says the only way a minister can get a larger income in the average-sized parish is to greatly extend his reach out into the country and take in a large number of farmers. He based that upon his study of the income of the farmers in this state. A study of farmers' incomes in the whole country shows that the farmer is not paying himself as much as he pays his hired man. The landlord or small owner is paying himself three per cent on his investment and labor. Land values are high, independent of income, and that is what Dr. Dillard may

accomplish by securing higher appraisal and through taxes getting more for the schools. The church can get the only substantial improvement of its budget from the farmers' actual earned income. The church is injured by high land values.

Dr. K. L. Butterfield.

There is one thing I think ought to be said that naturally would not be said by Dr. Carver, and that is that the United States Department of Agriculture has recently enlarged its point of view with regard to a capacity for service to our country life. I do not say this in criticism of any former administration; I think that this expansion of view has grown largely out of the new rural awakening. There is in the public mind, in the country and in the city, a new demand upon Government agencies for the helping of agricultural matters. A few years ago you could not get a group of men—agricultural college professors, for example—to discuss seriously the possibility of Government aid, either through departments or colleges, to the country life side of the rural question. They were not thinking in these terms. They were thinking in terms of in-

creasing the production, and of profit. Now it is entirely different. The department is but reflecting the new spirit. I believe this change of attitude on the part of the Department of Agriculture at Washington is absolutely epoch-making; for it means not only that the Federal Government is taking the new attitude, but it means that the agricultural college, the experiment station and all other forces of agricultural education everywhere, in fact all of those institutions that are supported by the state, have a new attitude. I do not believe we can foresee the consequences of this new point of view.

THE U. S. RURAL ORGANIZATION SERVICE

DR. THOMAS N. CARVER
United States Department of Agriculture

The way the rural organization service came to be established was something as follows: Congress a little less than a year ago made an appropriation of $50,000 for the study of the problem of marketing farm produce. The present Secretary of Agriculture, when he began to consider how this money should be used, found that the problem of marketing was largely a problem of organization and that organized marketing was only one part of the general problem of rural organization. However, there was only an appropriation for the one subject—marketing. The General Education Board which has been for some years helping to finance the Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration work in the South came forward and offered to put some of its funds, a small sum, at the disposal of the Department in order

that the whole work might be planned at least in a preliminary way, that is, work outside the office of markets. The Secretary, after a good deal of thought and with the advice of the President, accepted this offer and started what is known as the Rural Organization Service. A beginning has been made in the organization or establishment of a division of rural finance and also of farmers' business organizations. But this is only a beginning.

Now the reason for this move lies in the well-known fact that agriculture is notoriously unorganized as compared with other interests and industries. There is no mystery about this. It results naturally and almost necessarily from several facts. In the first place, there are so many farmers—about six and a half million of them—and to organize that many individuals in any movement is difficult. They are widely separated. The mere question of geometry is an important factor of the problem. City people live close together. The geometrical difficulties are less in the way of getting together in the case of city people than of country people. And then I am inclined to think there is something of the nature of a temperamental difficulty.

The country seems to attract people with rather stronger individualism than the city does. People in the habit of working together, people who can work under bosses, in herds or flocks or congregations, naturally prefer city to country life and move to the city; whereas the people who are temperamentally unfitted for work in crowds, who cannot work under bosses, who must be self-directed, tend in the long run to seek the country or remain there. So that you have a sort of sifting process going on. There are therefore three perfectly good reasons why agriculture is disorganized or unorganized; the great number of farmers, their wide separation in point of space, and their extreme individualism.

Because there are difficulties in the way of organizing farmers, however, is no reason for not doing it. What have we used our intelligence for these thousands of years in building up a civilization except in the overcoming of difficulties?

They who cannot work together or will not work together are the natural prey of the people who can. I am also inclined to say that they are the legitimate prey of the people who can. Although the difficulties of

working together in the country are greater than in the city, these difficulties must be overcome on the part of country people by stronger moral principles than are necessary in the city. I think it is a safe observation that any community made up of people who are very particular about their rights—which means, of course, being particular about other people's obligations—will find difficulty in working together. Such people are always disorganized. But people who are very careful of their own obligations—which means careful of other people's rights—are easy to get along with. You know that. If you ever have a neighbor who is very particular about his own obligations and your rights, you have no difficulty unless you are somewhat cantankerous yourself. If you are both careful of the other man's rights and your obligations, you will never have difficulty in getting along. I believe that is one of the greatest moral facts in the world today. There never was a great moral leader in this world, so far as I know, who did not make the burden of his message—look after your own obligations. You never heard of a great moral leader talking to people about their own rights. He tells them about their obli-

gations, which means other people's rights, and when they follow him they get along together. You find any community made up of the kind of people who are careful of their own obligations and other people's rights and you have a prosperous and strong community because they are organized and can work together. But take a community made up of the opposite kind of people, very particular about their own rights and other people's obligations, and you will always find a disorganized community. We need not waste any sympathy on them, for we must admit, I think, when we face the matter squarely and frankly that morals and religion, just as much as teeth and claws, horns and hoofs, are factors in the struggle for existence. This is the end of the doctrinal part of my discourse.

What we are trying to do is first to find out the facts regarding agricultural organizations in this country. We find when we begin to look that there is really a great deal of organization among our farmers already, but it is desultory; there is no coordination or federation. At least there is very poor coordination and federation of the existing organizations. We have hundreds of thou-

sands of farmers organized in mutual associations of all kinds; mutual insurance companies, mutual telephone companies, cooperative buying associations of all kinds. We even have a pretty well organized system of cooperative rural credit, which people have not suspected. In fact there is now going on in this country cooperative rural credit in all essential particulars like the Crédit Foncier of France, and in most essential parts like the Landschaften of Germany, an association of borrowers rather than lenders, who apply the principles of amortization to the payment of their debts.

If we can find out what methods of organization have succeeded and what have failed, and can put that information at the disposal of farmers and others who are interested in rural organization, that will be, I think, of considerable value to the movement. But in addition to merely finding out the facts, I think it is quite within the function of this service to do some promoting. If we find, for example, in one community the credit facilities are very poor, whereas in another some hundreds of miles away they are very good, and if we can make that fact known in the community where the conditions are

poor, that in itself will be a kind of promotion. I think we might go so far as to put a man into the field to see what he could do toward encouraging the people in the badly served community to imitate what we find in the well served community.

But then in addition to these business organizations, there is no reason in the world why we should not go out into new fields. We ought, for example, I believe, to have a division of rural sanitation, not as an investigating body, not a purely scientific body, but an organization to prepare the rural people to avail themselves of, to make use of, the knowledge of sanitation which is already in existence. It was one of the ideas of the late Dr. Knapp that there is enough knowledge of agricultural facts already in existence to revolutionize the farming of any community if the farmers will take it and put it into practice. So instead of organizing scientific or investigating bodies, it is necessary to organize the farmers in local communities to apply on their own farms the knowledge that is already in existence, that has been accumulated by the investigating and scientific agencies.

I think something of that kind ought to

be done by the rural organization service through its division of sanitation. The same might be said of rural recreation and of rural beautification. Suppose a few farmers in a community do fix up their grounds, roads, fences and make them look decent, if the other half of the farmers neglect theirs, this still gives the community a bad appearance. But if they can organize themselves and all work together they can beautify the countryside in a very attractive way, making use of expert knowledge in such matters.

Then there is the everlasting woman question—the question of the farmer's wife. What are we going to do for her. (One woman from Mississippi wrote that down there every farmer wore out three wives.) Now suppose you did introduce all sorts of labor-saving devices into the farm home. Perhaps exactly the same thing would happen as when they introduced the sewing machine. Our grandmothers sewed by hand. Probably our grandmothers did not work any harder than the housewives of today. A labor-saving device does not reduce the amount of work you have to do, it merely enables you to do a great many other things which you did not find necessary before. If you

have been doing your own correspondence or letter-writing and get a typewriter, you do not do any less work. You write more letters, that is all. But suppose the farm women of the community could be organized to set their standards and do what they thought necessary instead of each one trying to excel and outshine someone else, or imitate somebody in the city; then if there never was another labor-saving device invented for household use, the problem would solve itself. So if the farm women would set their own standards, and do the things they want to do, and not do the things they feel they have to do to keep up with the procession, they would amazingly reduce the drudgery of farm life.

In the State of Ohio, in which Oberlin is situated, and where I lived for six years not knowing what was going on, there are saving and loan associations very much after the order of the old building loan associations which operated in the towns. They have gone into the country and are now doing twelve million dollars worth of business in that state alone with farm mortgages. They charge six per cent, which is a little higher than is charged by many foreign cooperative

credit associations, and the maximum period of amortization is twelve years, which is shorter than it is abroad.

Two essential principles—organization of borrowers instead of organization of lenders, and slow amortization of debts—are embodied in this plan. These organizations are inspected under the laws of that state as carefully as banks are inspected. There is no other state in which the development is quite so great as in Ohio. I am willing to change my mind, but I think that if we can take a movement of this kind and carry its work a little further, we shall have on our own soil practically the same thing that we have been going to Europe to discover.

An idea occurred to me in connection with a statement already made. The late George Peabody is reported to have said, apropos of investments and speculations in our investors' markets, that any man in America who is systematically a bear rather than a bull was certain to go "broke." There was a certain large, practical optimism in that remark which I think rather important for County Work men to bear in mind. There will be questions of divided opinion in your counties and in your communities. One group of men

will want to be doing something useful, another will hold back on account of expense—too heavy taxes, too much trouble—and you have either got to be neutral or take sides. Now any man in America who takes sides with the people who see only the obstacles is going to become bankrupt spiritually and in every other way. The way to build safely is to be on the side of the people who are doing useful things even though it costs something. This is merely a little bit of general, practical philosophy.

Discussion

Dr. Earp.

I want to call attention to one of Dr. Carver's remarks about the people who could not get together being the "legitimate prey" of those who could get together, and note the contrast such a statement makes with the splendid philosophy of those who could get together on the basis of regarding the rights of others and their own obligations to others which he also spoke about in his excellent address. I did not want anyone to go out with the understanding that Dr. Carver had the opinion that they were the "legitimate prey" of those who get to-

gether on the other basis—that is, of looking after their own rights and talking about the obligations of others to them. I think he meant to say that the people in the open country who have been apparently the prey of organized economic forces in the cities have no one to blame but themselves if they are unwilling to organize and cooperate to meet them. He certainly did not wish to leave the impression that anybody was the legitimate prey of any predatory group that succeeded by exploiting the weakness of others.

Dr. Carver.

I should perhaps defend myself in this way. The way to remedy that is not to scold the people who get together on the basis we do not like. I do not think you can accomplish that by going after them and calling them monopolists. You have got to do it by organizing yourselves on the basis of mutual obligations within a community. I believe in the neighborhood as a unit, and that any neighborhood that finds itself the prey of monopolistic forces will accomplish more, in the long run, by organizing than by making speeches of denunciation.

THE COUNTRY CHURCH AND THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

PROFESSOR G. WALTER FISKE
Oberlin Theological Seminary

In general, how shall *cooperation* take the place of *competition?*

Pending a better unity in religious forces, what unique opportunities come to the County Young Men's Christian Association?

What serious defects in rural church life can the County Work help to remedy?

What can the Association do which the Church cannot?

How can the rural pastor cooperate with the Association secretary?

How must the Church conserve the results of the Association's work?

In the specific field of religious education how can the county secretary cooperate with the pastors?

In this topic of mutual relations between two great rural forces, I have a single toast to propose: *cooperation* in the place of *competition.* To people interested in rural reconstruction, this is a very familiar slogan. It has been sounded on every great rural

issue from agriculture to education and religion. Whatever may be true in the city, in the country wasteful competition is a social crime. We have found a large measure of cooperation essential to any form of rural progress, and in nothing more essential than in religious forces. Christian people in the country must cooperate. Christian institutions must work in harmony. Rural Christian forces simply must cooperate: The Kingdom of God, that new world of our hopes, will never come until they do.

With the vexed question of securing cooperation between various competing rural churches, elbowing each other in a painfully overchurched field, this particular paper has nothing directly to do. Our task in the twenty minutes alloted to the opening of this discussion is to consider the rural church as a unit in its relation to its friend and ally, the rural Young Men's Christian Association.

There has never been, to my knowledge, any established program of mutual responsibilities, or division of function agreed upon by these two rural institutions. This may have been because the rural Associations are not numerous, their work has but recently been standardized, and the several secre-

taries, of quite different types, have developed along somewhat different lines of leadership and service. It will not be easy to define the relative functions and the normal relationships of these two important rural institutions; but for the good of the cause we will at least make the attempt, and through frank discussion a few main principles may be established.

To clear the air, perhaps I may be allowed a few preliminary words to my friends the ministers and the secretaries. Let me suggest to my friend the county secretary, that because a man has been ordained, and has laid himself liable to the title "Reverend," he may be none the less a man, an up-to-date man, and capable of large and high leadership. And may I suggest to my friend the country minister, that just because the county secretary has usually not been ordained, and is only a plain "Mister," does not indicate that he is not of the glorious company of the apostles and the noble army of martyrs! I know many a plain county secretary whom I count just as really in the ranks of the Christian ministry as myself, though they have never "taken orders"—except perhaps from Albert E. Roberts! We all have to take

orders from him. And let me remind my brother ministers that we no longer have occasion to speak of "the Y. M. C. A. viewpoint," as something essentially superficial or unscholarly, or the Association secretary as a man half-trained. It is not so true of the city secretaries, but about 75 per cent of the county secretaries are college-trained men. I wish the country pastors were as well educated.

And again, may I remind my friend the rural secretary, that after all is said and done, the Christian Association in city or country is and must always be an ally of the church. To the church, fostering mother of all religious and philanthropic enterprises in these blessed modern days, to the church must we look for the inspiration, the ultimate support of all our efforts, and the permanent conservation of our best results.

To be frank, we must all face the fact that the interests of the church and Association, of rural pastor and county secretary are so interwoven as to be essentially identical. Here is no place for unholy rivalry, ungenerous jealousy or unchristian competition. Let us view our common tasks, the tremendous burdens that we share, and see how we

can work out naturally and fairly an effective division of labor.

We have no time here to outline completely the function of the rural church. This has been done quite fully in our previous conferences. I am assuming general agreement that the country church today must be not only a meeting place for worship but a distributing point for service; that it must be a community- serving church, not a self-seeking church; serving broadly the deepest needs of the community, not merely of its own membership; that its business is to get the religion of Christ into the life of the community—to Christianize the rural community, using the term in the broadest sense of the social gospel. I realize painfully that in very many country places the church is not accomplishing this. It is not serving in a broad way the needs of the community. Perhaps it is not even deserving the respect of the community. And it is certainly not getting the religion of Jesus into the life of the community, mainly because it is trusting too much to talk. To say that all this is ultimately the community's fault is not absolving the church from its failure.

The term "function" is a biological term.

It has to do, of course, not with machinery, but with life. It is a well known fact that a function atrophies from disuse. We are all familiar with the rural church which has become decadent, because year after year the atrophy of function, through neglect of service, has become more and more deadly, until nothing is left but a voice, and an imported voice at that, brought in once a fortnight, may be, from the nearest town.

To estimate the proper function of the country church by such decadent churches is of course unfair. The country church, like every institution, must be judged at its best, not at its worst; and its normal function must be determined by its possibilities, its opportunities, its best successes. The same consideration is due the work of the rural Young Men's Christian Association, which is no longer a social experiment, but has several decades of success to its credit.

The chief reason why the country church in America is not functioning as it might under normal conditions, is the awful multiplication of sects and division of forces. There is very little community leadership to be expected from a divided church. Until Christians get together, the church is not

going to be the dominant force for social righteousness and progress which it might be and ought to be. Church competition and selfish rivalries and struggles for self-support in an over-churched township paralyze the Christian initiative of all the churches and tend to postpone indefinitely many movements for building up the community.

Where the churches are well united and cooperative, or better, where the community has but one church, a strong, influential organization, I see no valid reason why the church itself may not rightly assume the position of leadership in all matters of general community welfare. With the meager socialization of country communities, such a church would probably be the leading institution in the township, and it should use its latent power for leadership. It should develop and strengthen the vital issues of community life, in order that its community may become an efficient part of the kingdom of God. As rural Christendom becomes better united and better socialized, the church will come to its own again, as in the old days when it was so often the only outstanding institution in the community and rightly assumed the effective

leadership in all matters vitally affecting the welfare of the people.

Unique Opportunity for Harmonizing.

In country places where we find two, three or a half dozen little mutually suspicious churches, a neutral Christian leader with native efficiency, tact and training, like the average county secretary, has a great chance for influence and for service. Pending a better unity among country churches, I believe the rural Association leader has a unique function as a harmonizer of diverse elements and an organizer of local forces for cooperative community service. He has to earn the confidence of the people, gradually perhaps, but when he wins it, he is welcome in every church and perhaps in the pulpit of every church, and his advice is taken for what it is worth. If he is a trained county secretary, it will be worth a great deal, and it will often be heeded. As a trusted neutral among the churches, he of all men has the best chance to overcome their rivalries and disarm their jealousies and unite them in a working federation. Then he will be able to lead them in needed community service.

He too can use the advantage of neutrality by bringing together the religious leaders in a County Ministers Union which has large possibilities.

What Serious Defects in Rural Church Life Can the County Work Help to Remedy?

It attacks the point of most serious neglect—the boys.

It provides a platform of cooperation and offers a program of definite service to a church whose work is often desultory and aimless. It suggests plans which have been proved and tested in other and similar situation, to people whose personal resourcefulness is apt to be meager.

It can teach country people social cooperation in which the churches are now so weak; beginning on the fundamental basis of recreation and games and leading them ultimately to work together for a common cause. It can teach the country church successful financing on a budget system and the development of systematic giving. It can develop local leadership and train it in some special community service.

It can help to fill the sad gaps between

parishes and between pastorates, the two great leakages in rural church work. The rural Christian Association can teach country people how to keep up the work of organized religion without resident pastors. This is probably the worst factor in country church failure. Proportionately few country churches really have pastors. Nine-tenths of them have preachers, but they live generally in the nearest town or village, not on the land with their people, and are, therefore, of a different class in their life interests and their thinking. The rural people need shepherding. There are not shepherds enough to go around and such as they are are not distributed according to the needs of the sheep. I see no hope of immediate improvement. We have simply got to find substitutes for shepherds, country pastors, by developing efficient *lay leadership* and training it as rural Association local leaders are being trained.

What Can the Association Do Which the Church Cannot?

It depends very greatly on the character of the leadership in both. The thoroughly

effective church could probably be organized to conduct in the community most of the activities of the rural Association if it chose to do so. Under ordinary conditions, the Association can more easily conduct a successful work with boys and can best develop the boys' latent talents and capacities. Often churches are quite unable to do this, especially when the boys are in non-Christian homes. The Association can regulate the athletic life of a rural county and set a standard of wholesome sportsmanship, which the church would be quite handicapped in undertaking.

The Association seems to be able to get boys to undertake with enthusiasm cooperative Bible study, even when Sunday schools are failing with these same boys. The Association, because of its non-sectarian character, has a better approach to unchurched men on lines of general community interest. It has an undivided field and can draw on the entire community for its forces and resources. The Association secretary can do a broader variety of community service than the pastor because he is not tied to the weekly routine of two sermons a week, a serious drain on strength and time. In general when the

Association secretary has a training superior to that of the rural pastor, as is so often true, he can do many things the latter cannot do, because of his special preparation.

How Can the Rural Pastor Cooperate with the Association Secretary?

He can certainly cooperate by forgetting prejudice and suspicion and working with him as a brother minister; by realizing that success in the Association means ultimately success for the church; by studying with the secretary and his local leaders the entire problem of community needs and progress. He should accept the Association as an integral part of the organized religious forces of the community for certain specific ends, notably the development of effective Christion manhood of boys and young men.

He can enlist the trained secretary for training his church workers, particularly his Sunday school workers and helping him develop the latent leadership in the parish. He can make his preaching and his parish work thoroughly practical and in accord with the social gospel of Jesus. He can encourage his people to cooperate in all legitimate and

worthy plans for community service which the Association develops and fosters. He can affiliate with the County Committee of the Association and give it the weight of his personal influence and endorsement, and keep informed about its work.

How Must the Church Conserve the Results of the Association's Work?

Very clearly the church is the ultimate organization in the field and, in the best sense, the real conservative agency; that is, the church is ordinarily the permanent institution, relatively speaking at least. The Association should make as much of its work as possible contributory to the church. The motive for this should not be merely the aggrandizement of the church, but the welfare of the individuals involved and the welfare of Christ's kingdom. Let the Association frankly acknowledge that much of its good work would be wasted and its good results be lost unless conserved by the church. City Associations have been learning this fact. It is just as true in the country. Church membership and loyal support and enthusiastic service in the church should be among the defi-

nite goals of the Association's social evangelism. The Association secretary should not regard himself in any sense as a competitor of the pastors in his field. He should work as closely in harmony with them as conditions will allow. Men, keep close to the church.

In the Specific Field of Religious Education How Can the County Secretary Cooperate With the Pastors?

Again, it depends on the individual, but usually, the county secretary, with other valuable items of personal equipment, has three great assets: special knowledge of boy life and its development; special training in adapting the Bible to the needs of boys and young men, and a vital, vigorous moral enthusiasm. Possessing these things, the county secretary will share them, and should raise the level of the biblical teaching and boy leadership of the county. To the degree of his actual training, he has the responsibility of the specialist. He should help the pastors discern and train adequate Sunday school teachers and superintendents and get the rural Sunday schools out of the dismal rut

of the tame and ineffective commonplace so many of them are revolving in. Quite possibly, where the Christian forces are well united, even the Bible study classes of the rural Association could be correlated with the rural churches as extension work of the Sunday schools, and sometimes even in the church itself.

Now specifically on the matter of function, I would like to say a few concluding words. My general working principle would be this: The church is the primary agency for rural welfare. The Association is a supplemental agency. The church is a definitely localized center of activity. The Association can supplement the church geographically by filling the gaps between these centers on its group-organization plan. The church has certain definite spiritual ministries which will always be its main function. The Association can supplement these where they are weak and also broaden the church's program, as one of the social service agencies of the church. The church finds itself embarrassed in dealing with some great community interests like education, economics, etc. Here again the Association can supplement, carrying the church's purpose into effect in these

fields. As a community-wide, county-wide Christian force the Association is unlimited in the scope of its activities and can therefore easily wield sometimes a local leadership denied to any denominational church.

In general, however, one great factor cuts across all these suggestions. It is the personal factor. The function of both country pastor and county secretary will be long determined by what they each know and what they can each do. This means that in some places a particularly forceful and effective pastor will quite transcend the usual functions of the church by the breadth of his program and his influence. In other places where the pastors may be quite lacking in initiative and in definite knowledge of rural life and of the modern rural awakening, a county secretary, well equipped and thoroughly trained, by the sheer force of superiority automatically leads the religious and social development of his field. We can make no hard and fast rules to prevent either of these things happening. The inevitable will go right on happening in spite of our rules. Keep on developing your specialists. We need them both in the pulpit and in the county Association office.

THE PLACE OF THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION IN THE NEW RURAL AWAKENING

PRESIDENT KENYON L. BUTTERFIELD
Massachusetts Agricultural College

From the days of Washington, American agriculture has received constant and intelligent attention from Government and from thoughtful men. A system of agricultural education has been developed, unequalled in any other country for inclusiveness of design and generosity of financial support. The United States Department of Agriculture is doubtless the largest governmental organization in the world devoted to agricultural affairs. Both national and state legislation have reflected the farmers' interests and needs. Meanwhile, too, a vast, rich continent has been subdued to the plow. Nowhere else can we find so many yeoman farmers with so high a standard of life; nowhere so free a

movement from the farmer class to the ranks of professional life and public leadership.

But we have discovered serious deficiencies in our agriculture and country life. We have found that our productivity per acre is low; that our system of distributing farm products is costly, and unjust both to producer and consumer; that too much of the best farm blood flows permanently to the city; that soil fertility is often quickly depleted; that transient tenancy is alarmingly increasing; that the scarcity of farm labor is driving many farmers from their occupation; that educational and social advantages often lag in arrears of business success and of urban standards.

The gradual recognition of such rural defects as these has, in very recent years—only a half dozen years, in fact—moulded a public opinion that has now reached a constructive stage—or one that at least demands a plan for rural amelioration. This public opinion is the possession of both the rural and the urban groups. It is not always intelligent, full-orbed, wide-visioned; but it is insistent, and therefore calls for wise leadership, sane counsel, and immediate but funda-

mental plans. This public opinion is, I take it, "the new rural awakening."

Inherent in this "new rural awakening" is the desire to utilize social machinery, organized effort, for making plans and for carrying them into effect. Old agencies are being rejuvenated and new ones created for this purpose. One of these agencies, neither worn by age nor yet untried, is the rural or county work department of the Young Men's Christian Association. Strong in the confidence of a real mission, conscious of proved powers, alert in aggressive leadership, and yet thoughtful of fundamental values, this organization pauses to ask its friends, frankly—Are we finding our place in this great, new, significant, rural awakening in America? First, give us your opinion of what that place is, and then tell us how we may best fit into the need for such work as we can do. I have been asked to open the way to a sympathetic answer to these questions, and I respond gladly because I have a profound interest in the rural work of the Association, a high esteem for its leadership, and am quickened to enthusiasm by the very fact that the leaders are big enough and broad enough to recognize the need of setting

compass to a definite course, at a time when so many proposals are offered for meeting the deficiencies of American agriculture and country life.

To attempt an adequate answer to this frank questioning of the Association I think we must first press a little further the query—What is the real purpose of "the new rural awakening"? We have defined it broadly—what is its inner meaning. This purpose, this meaning has several elements. First of all, there is a new appreciation by city people, especially by important business men, of agriculture as a national asset, to be cherished on statesmanlike lines. Again, urban consumers have come to see that the food problem is a pressing problem and is in the hands of the farmers. Moreover, the farmers themselves, although in an era of relative prosperity, realize that they have come to the end of a characteristic epoch in American agriculture and are entering upon a new chapter which presents new problems. There is, furthermore, a general recognition that concerted effort is necessary in order to remedy the defects of our agriculture and rural life and to meet the twentieth century farm questions. There is also a new defini-

tion of the problem of rural life. This problem, in a sense, is defined by the defects already mentioned. From the public point of view it is a question of food supply, of conservation of soil resources, of the preservation of the social and economic status of the farming class; from the point of view of the individual it means greater business success for the mass of individual farmers and a constantly bettering type of life in farm communities. Thus we now recognize that the rural problem is very inclusive and exceedingly complex, and must be approached on large lines and cooperatively. In fine, "the new rural awakening" consists in a general recognition of the existence of a real rural problem, significant to national wealth and welfare, and meaning nothing more nor less than the task of planning and of securing, by collective effort, a higher and better rural civilization.

I have said *a* rural problem advisedly. No phase of "the new rural awakening" is more significant than the admission that there is *a* rural problem. We must think of it as a unit. This is fundamental. But, of course, we cannot solve it as a unit; or rather, while we must solve it as a whole, after all, practi-

cally speaking, we are obliged to attack it at many, many points; for it has many elements. It is far too big, too complex to be met by some one simple method.

It may clarify our thought as to the task of solving the rural problem if we break up the question into groups of questions. I wish to suggest three main groups of rural problems that must be met and, I believe, met by organized effort; at any rate, they are classes of questions that the individual farmer must face.

1. The first group includes the problems of farm improvement. How can we improve the soil? How can we have better breeds of plants and animals? How can we secure better systems of farm management? How can we better protect against the ravages of plant and animal diseases and pests? These questions all have a vital bearing on our ability to produce the maximum amount from our soil. But from the standpoint of the consumer, as well as from that of the farmer, we have not yet solved the farm problem when we have increased productivity; so we find naturally a second group, namely:

2. The problems of marketing and exchange. How can the farmer get money in

order to carry on his business to advantage? This involves the question of rural credit. How can he best buy his supplies? How can he best sell his products? In America we have heretofore relied largely on the ability of the individual to settle these questions for himself; in Europe they have found it necessary to do these things collectively, and we believe now that the American farmers will soon be forced to the use of the same method. Here are matters of the highest importance. But we have not yet exhausted the questions that arise in connection with the development of our agriculture, and there comes to mind a third group of problems that may be called:

3. The problems of the community life. This group comprises such questions as the efficiency of rural government; the influence of the rural home; the enrichment of the rural school; the leadership of the rural church; the attainment of adequate social and recreative facilities; the maintenance of good morals; the beautification of homesteads and roadsides.

Of course this is not absolutely a scientific grouping. I have not mentioned at all the great scientific questions that are the subject-matter of costly research by nation and by

states. Nor have I included such questions of large import as taxation, the tariff, tenantry, financial systems, in their influence on the business of agriculture. I have just made a practical working grouping for the purpose of defining a little more clearly what is ahead of us if we are to meet this demand of "the new rural awakening" for a constructive plan.

It would be interesting to discuss the place of social institutions generally in meeting such issues as we have raised. I am inclined to think that in this day of insistence upon the social point of view we are apt to minimize the individual, and perhaps to rely too much on the group; but we have no time today to study the relationship between the individual and the group. Most of us are pretty thoroughly committed to the proposition that, under modern conditions, collective effort is absolutely essential to meet the issues of our civilization.

At the outset we recognize two main classes of institutions—those managed by Government at public expense, and those wholly voluntary and supported at private expense. We are not called upon today to discuss at any length the function of Govern-

ment in helping to solve the rural problem, because we recognize that an institution like the Young Men's Christian Association has no purpose to do work that the Government is doing. At the same time, even in Association work, it is necessary to have a clear notion as to where the work of Government shall cease and where main reliance must be placed upon voluntary effort. Let me then state rather arbitrarily my present attitude toward the work of the Government, meaning by "government"—national, state, or local. The Government certainly has an educational function. We are committed to publicly supported education, even of a technical character. It is also obvious that the Government must administer certain laws relative to agriculture. We are not yet quite sure of the extent to which Government may go in attempting to correlate the various activities on behalf of the agricultural movement; though personally I believe that Government may and should, at least as a temporary leader, seek to correlate and ally the various agencies for rural progress.

Is there a limit beyond which the Government may not go in these matters of education, administration, and correlation? This

much seems clear: The Government should *investigate,* for the purpose of discovering facts and principles; it should *interpret* these facts and principles in the light of existing need; it should *inform* the masses of the people of the significance of these facts and principles in their application to existing need; it should stand ready to *advise* as to the way in which these facts and principles may best be applied; and it may even go so far as to demonstrate its faith in its own advice, and thus give objective illustration of the way in which truth may be made applicable to practical conditions. But the Government may not participate in agriculture. It cannot run a man's farm for him; it should not try to run the farmers' collective business for them, nor to manage a rural community.

I like to think that this three-fold work of the Government in administration of laws, education, and correlation, applies to the entire range of the problems of agriculture and country life, and may be just as helpful in solving all problems as in solving any one problem. But I am bound to say that practically there are serious limitations to governmental activity. For example, how far can the Government go in its advisory work

with reference to the country church? As a practical matter, would a Government investigation of the influence of the tariff on agriculture be regarded as unprejudiced, no matter what party was in power? Then there are limitations as to the amount of money available for government work. We are soon to find in our agricultural program that it is impossible for the Federal Government or for the States to appropriate sufficient money to do all that could legitimately be done by the Government, and consequently that more and more reliance must be placed upon local and private support and activity. Moreover, it is well for farmers to manage their own affairs. In the long run they will do it better than anybody else. It strengthens them as a class. The Government can and should do what neither individuals nor voluntary organizations can achieve. Speaking broadly, the Government should seek to stimulate the maximum of activity and self-management on the part of farmers, both individually and through associated effort.

Turning now to these associated or voluntary efforts for the betterment of agriculture and country life, we find a multitude of agencies. Some of these agencies are of

primary importance, such as the home, the church, and the school. Others are evidently supplementary in character, such as the village improvement society, the horticultural society, etc. Apparently, as time goes on these voluntary associations will group themselves quite naturally into agencies either chiefly for farm improvement, or chiefly for marketing and exchange, or chiefly for the betterment of community life. Of course, there will be some associations, like the great farmers' organizations, that will cover more than one field, but there will surely be a tendency toward a pretty sharp division of labor among these institutions. I think we will all agree that the Young Men's Christian Association is not immediately concerned with the problems of farm improvement, nor indeed with the problems of marketing and exchange. It recognizes that a permanent rural community life can be built only on a thoroughly developed farm productivity and a sound and economical method of distribution of products. But its especial task is not primarily to forward these technical interests; it is essentially a community life agency.

And now at length we face the real question that I was asked to answer. Does the

rural Young Men's Christian Association desire to serve as a general community-life agency, or has it a specialized task? Is it not fair to approach the answer to the last question by calling attention to the very name of the Association? It is first of all a voluntary Association, seeking to band people together; it is not a public agency, nor supported at public expense; it is independent of state control; it evidently seeks a function that lies outside of state effort. Moreover, the idea of associated or cooperative purpose and effort is emphasized. The comradeship of like-minded men for meeting a great need is encouraged. In the second place, it is an Association of young men; it seeks to band together boys and young men. Older men may help mightily; but the object is to help boys and young men. It is essentially religious; it marches under the Christian flag; it inculcates the Christian motive; it proclaims itself a regiment of the Christian army.

There are many questions that arise the moment we permit ourselves statements like those just made. What type of work is to be done in this outreach for boys and young men, under the Christian banner? Is it work

that some other institutions ought to do but do not do, or is it work that none other can do? Is the Association religious only in the narrow sense, or does it seek to develop the religious motive in all human activity in the country? Again, how does it reconcile its work with that of the church or of the Sunday school, which avow, or may avow, the same aim? Has it not, as a matter of fact, an even larger aim growing out of a fundamental rural necessity? Should it not seek to be the great rural clearing house and attempt to integrate or coordinate all local rural activities? The statement of my own view of the work of the Association in its rural department may not answer all these queries, but I hope it will suggest answers to them; it will at least raise the issue.

The rural Young Men's Christian Association, in seeking to take its place in "the new rural awakening," must first of all define its work. I suggest this definition: "The special mission of the rural Young Men's Christian Association is, by means of helpful comradeship and inspiring leadership, to influence boys and young men living in the country on behalf of a complete manhood motived by the Christ spirit." It will teach

that this complete manhood can be secured only by a growth that comes when one's play, one's toil, one's study, one's thinking are directed by and suffused with the spirit of self-control and of loving service. The Association, in other words, will seek to relate the country boy both to his special task of individual character-building and to his problem of assisting in the work of rural-community-building. The boy or young man is to be brought to see that these fundamental issues of life must be met under the inspiration of the religious motive, solved on Christian principles, and by Christian methods.

Hence the Association will direct its efforts to the youth of the countryside. They will be asked to band themselves with others in order that they may be helped to work out this dual problem of character-building and community-building on the highest possible lines. The conventional division of effort and emphasis will be followed; that is, the development of the physical, the intellectual, and the spiritual. But the great effort will be to try to bring the boy and young man to see that religion is a life and not a doctrine; that it is an attitude and not a garment; that it is a motive and spirit and not an artificial

classification of men, and consequently that all life can be made religious. The splendid historic emphasis of the Association upon leadership-training will, therefore, be forever enforced because of a fundamental belief in the power of personality, and an abiding faith in the influence of allegiance to persons—an allegiance that culminates in a perpetual and consciously rendered loyalty to the crowning Person of all. The Association will regard itself not as a primary social institution, but as supplementary; not as intended to take the place of home, school, or church, but as performing a service that it is difficult, under present conditions, for home, school, or church to fulfill.

It is obvious that any such policy as this will immediately bring up the questions—what shall be the relationship of the Association to home, school, church, etc? If the Association is supplementary, in what way is it supplementary? Let me illustrate.

It is commonly believed that the home is not fulfilling its full function in the life of the boy. I think the Association should attempt to supplement, though not to supplant, the home. It should do for the boy what the father ought to do, but does not

do for him. But I think it ought to go further and try, in an organized way, to get the fathers to do more for their boys. In other words, the Association will be a father to the boy, and will do for the boy what perhaps the father cannot do, but will also seek to bring vision to the fathers and will even go so far as to help the fathers of a community in their boy problems. So with the school. I think the school should be the natural recreative center for the pupils of the school, but it is not so and until there is such support for the schools that this work can be organized, the school is not likely to fulfill this function adequately. The Young Men's Christian Association in the country community can supplement the school, but it ought also to help to bring the school to function fully and properly. If the school is defective in reaching boys on the educational side, the Association can help there.

The question of the church and the Sunday school presents the greatest difficulty, and yet I cannot see why the same principle may not be valid. If these agencies can do for the boy all that needs to be done for him by institutions professing the development of religion as the chief function, there will be

no place for the Association. But as a matter of fact, these agencies are not doing all that needs doing for the boy and I doubt if they are likely to do so for a long time to come. They ought, therefore, to welcome the Association as an ally.

Our agricultural colleges are now reaching out to the country boys more particularly through boys' agricultural clubs. I am not entirely clear as to just how the work of the school and the Association and the agricultural college can be related at this point. I am inclined to think that the school is the normal center of interest for the education of youth; that the agricultural college is the fountain of information on agricultural matters; and that when the Association steps into this work it should be to meet a supplementary need.

There are some who think that such organizations as the county farm demonstration bureaus, county leagues for rural improvement, county federations for rural progress, may take the place of rural work of the Association. I cannot agree, but I think there ought to be close cooperation between the Association and this county farm improvement work.

Now why may not the Young Men's Christian Association serve as the great integrating agency in the rural community? This is an attractive task and a vital one. Why shall we not ask the Association to make it its supreme task? Personally I do not believe that this is the function of the Young Men's Christian Association. In the first place, there is a certain sense in which we do not need an integrating agency. Integration must be on the federal or representative principle. That is, no existing institution can merge into itself other institutions. Indeed no existing institution can be the core of a system of correlated activity. If we are to have a real integration of country life interests it must be by voluntary or mutual cooperation of the agencies involved and not by the pulling together of these agencies under the leadership of any one agency that dominates them all.

Furthermore, the rural Young Men's Christian Association is not as yet a universal organization. Integration should go on rapidly. It should exist as soon as possible in every agricultural county and rural community. I am sure the Association is to grow, but I do not believe it will grow fast

enough for this purpose. Furthermore, I think that if any institution is to take a leadership in coordinating rural activities it must be either some recognized central voluntary committee, mutually established through the cooperation of all the agencies concerned, or else that the Government, as represented in the United States Department of Agriculture or in the extension service of the state agricultural college, should take the lead in stimulating the integrating process. I think, however, that the county committees of the Young Men's Christian Association may often be the local leaders in bringing about the correlation of rural activities either on neighborhood or on county lines, or both.

I have not specified concrete tasks for the Association. I have not been asked to do that, and indeed I am not competent to do it. In fact, concrete tasks, while always the final achievement and justification of social effort, gain their value from their intimate relationship to sound theory as well as sound method. They are the fruitage of a well-rooted tree. I have tried to describe the tree that will bear the right fruit. The fruit is a redeemed rural boyhood and young manhood. Methods of growing and ripening this fruit may

and will change. These methods may carry the Association into many subsidiary activities and relationships. But the one task to which the rural work must forever address itself, and of which in the multiplicity of practical devices it must never lose sight for one instant, is to reach rural youth effectively with the Christian message.

And now let me close by indicating my conception of the ideal rural Young Men's Christian Association.

1. It will be more an influence than an institution. It will attempt to create an atmosphere rather than to build up an elaborate machinery.

2. In so far as it has an institutional character, this will lie in the comradeship of multitudes of country boys and young men. The band or group spirit will be its great asset, and the fraternal feeling will be developed for high ends.

3. The heart of this enterprise is a virile man, a rural work secretary, backed by a strong committee, all holding a clear conception both of the opportunities and the limitations of the Association and whose chief function is so to influence boys and young men that there will gradually be gathered together

bands of comrades who are seeking to solve their life problems on the highest lines and who are anxious to help others to do the same.

4. The Association will supplement other institutions rather than seek to become itself an institution. It will not only supplement the school, and the home, and the church, and the grange, and the college, and the county demonstration work in anything that seeks to reach rural boys and young men, but it will do all it can to help those institutions to a larger activity in order that they may themselves reach boys more adequately, "function" more completely.

5. The Association will hold itself to be essentially a part of the common church, the federated church if you please, at work for the purpose of reaching boys.

6. This means a temporary function? Yes, in the willingness of the Association, and, in fact, its desire to turn over tasks to primary institutions as rapidly as they are willing to assume them; but actually a permanent function because, as we begin to realize the possibilities of service for boys we shall see the need of a specialized branch of country church activity on behalf of boys and

young men. I do not know what it may be called fifty years from now; possibly not the Young Men's Christian Association, though it will be that. For just as soon as the country churches "find" themselves, are ready to take that leadership in country life which the present situation imperatively demands, are prepared to work together as a unit, and are willing to sink institutionalism in vital religious service, then we will find the churches demanding that the rural Young Men's Christian Association shall come into every agricultural county in America.

I believe, therefore, in a permanent rural Young Men's Christian Association, but I believe that it will find its permanency in specialized work, in great elasticity of method and of specific achievement, and in everlastingly appealing before the public and before the boys themselves to the power of Christian comradeship in building the Kingdom of Heaven into both individual and community life.

Discussion

Dr. Wilson.

I have been asked to say a few words about the relation between the churches and

the Young Men's Christian Association in the country. This relation should be one of mutual appreciation and service. The work of the Association will be matured when the ministers in the country praise it. We may turn from pessimism to optimism about the country church when the secretaries of the Association commend it. Their relation to one another is not accidental, but essential. The Association is related to the country through the church, not independently of it, and the country church needs the Association to render a service not merely to the boys and young men in the country, but to the churches as organizations. It is my earnest hope that the Young Men's Christian Association shall become in the country a practical, working federation of churches on which we can rely.

The case of the country church is a good one. No other free organization has been able to float itself in the open country, and get its bills paid there and stand by the appreciation of farmers. It is the only free institution that is universal in the country. It is native to the general rural mind.

The Association is everywhere related to the church by a principle of selection. The committees which govern the Association are

selected from the churches. No matter how good a farmer or a merchant or a granger a man may be, his selection for a committee of management is dependent upon his being a member of an evangelical church, but he is chosen for his exceptional qualities: efficiency, piety, wealth or brains. The Association does not choose for its governing officers the women of the churches, the adolescents, the aged or the incompetent.

The church, on its part, is governed by all kinds of people. Its policies, since all evangelical churches are free, are conditioned by the kind of people that the Young Men's Christian Association does not select to govern its policies; namely, the aged, the incompetent, the adolescent, the women of the community and persons of an eccentric and devitalized character. It is the glory of the church that these people are in her membership. It is her glory also that she is governed by a free vote of her members. So that the policy of the Young Men's Christian Association is conditioned by the best people in the churches: the church's policies are conditioned by the most conservative, the least intellectual, the poorest and the most needy of the people.

Now that is the relation of the Association to the churches. This situation forbids Association men to criticize the churches. The policies of the Association should not be built upon the weaknesses of the church or the contrasting strength and efficiency of the Association, because this efficiency is secured through a principle of selection of the very best within the church, while the inefficiency or conservatism of churches is due to the width of their sympathies and freedom of their government. This situation logically requires that the Association render service to the churches and recognize its relation everywhere to the churches as an essential one. Its efficiency, celerity of action, insight into public affairs is a gift of the churches, whose best and ablest men are chosen for Association service. President Butterfield states the idea in his fine phrase, that the Association should be an "integrating organization."

Following this statement let me make one or two inferences. 1. The County Work is, it seems to me, the first of all branches of the Young Men's Christian Association to get away from individualism in service. It inherits the limitation "to young men," but

today it is forced to recognize that it has a civic, a communal responsibility, because in the country partial service cannot be rendered without undertaking to serve all the population. The service to young men or young women is only a beginning of the service to the whole community. I earnestly hope that it will not become the ideal in County Work to enroll a separate membership in the country, nor should the Association, in my hopes for it, boast of extent of individual membership. It should serve young men and women, primarily, for that purpose which it is to accomplish in the community through them.

2. I have grave doubts of the organizing of Christian Associations in the local community. I am not convinced that the Young Men's Christian Association has any duty to form a local organization in an already overchurched community. I do not think that it should compete with the rural congregation. We have too much competition now. Where there are Bible classes or where men's meetings could be held, it is not the business of the Association to organize Bible classes or men's meetings. Let the pastors do that. The Association cannot live by the defects of

churches nor claim a right to work because the churches are conservative or narrow. It may better serve those needy organizations and cooperate with them. So that I do not think that it has any credit in quoting a local membership as a form of service rendered.

3. The county unit is a great conception in the service to be rendered by the Association. The county secretary should be a statesman. The churches in the country need statesmen. Let the county secretaries do what Mr. Eastman is doing in Lorain County, Ohio. He holds a ministers' association, with meetings regularly at the county seat. Money can be raised to do what is necessary to make a ministers' association a great enterprise. Let the secretary be *"Servus servorum domini"* and he will come to be pope of the county, as the man who invented that fine phrase, became pope of the Catholic church. But I have in mind that he should serve all the interests of the county. Let him go to the jail, find what boys are there and write their people at home. Let him go to the poorhouses and be a friend to the poor of the county. Let him render service to the county superintendent of education. Let him stand as a statesman among

the statesmanlike types in the county. Let him represent all those churches and stand consistently from his first day to his last as a servant of the churches in the old civic conception of religion which the churches lack. I can see that in relation to the churches the Association promises to be, especially in its rural work, the greatest federation of churches that we have any real hope of just now. It will bring him by reason of that specific service into relation to all the agencies that are in the rural community.

Dr. Earp.

I have been very much interested in the change of titles in the programs of the last three years. I believe by next year, if we keep on this brotherly and sisterly way we will have the title—"The Country Church's Young Men's Christian Association." A man told me once that if in a company like this you keep your seat long enough somebody else will say all the good things you intended to say. Dr. Wilson and others have already said what I wanted to say. I was on the train in New Jersey the day before yesterday with an elect lady from the town where I live who has just come from Eng-

land. She said she asked an Englishman on the train in rural England what was the difference between a Vicar and a Rector, and he replied, "The Vicar receives the greater tithes." The distinction between the County Work Department and the country church is not who receives the greater credit, but who does the greater service. I want to say this, that the people in the country, speaking now from the standpoint of one brought up in the country, are willing as a rule to pay for what they get. The factor of service is the one that is going to be the criterion of all organization in the country, and, unless the country church does the work that is required in the situation, some other organization is going to take its place. It is not a question for us, whether it is to be the church or the Association, or both, but rather a question of both working in cooperation.

I think the County Work Department in the open country has these four or five very important things to do that the church, because of its history and its present organization, cannot do.

1. The Young Men's Christian Association is the only organization I know of that can furnish that coordinating factor, or what

I call a binder, for the unmistakable and yet useful elements of human Christianity, and it is doing it.

I was up in Vermont a week ago last Friday night at an annual meeting of the County Young Men's Christian Association. One of the gentlemen who sat with me at the speaker's table is present. For the first time they had practically all the leading country ministers in that county, twelve preachers and a Roman Catholic priest, at that banquet. I think it was a unique experience in the work of that splendid leader who has brought together at least once a year (and it shows they appreciate his work) a group of men who are unmistakably helped in a large degree in their religious work.

2. The County Work Department has a community plan, but the church has not yet worked it out, so far as the different denominations are concerned, but has worked on an individualistic, competitive plan. It has worked out no community program. That is to say, if the church is going to succeed in doing what the County Work Department has succeeded in doing in the open country, it must organize every church on a community basis whether it has competition or not

with other organizations. I should say that every country church today, I care not what its denominational history may be, or how many preachers it may have in a community, ought to be organized in that community, if it has any right to exist there at all, on a community basis rather than on a selfish basis.

3. It has a financial plan based upon the county unit that is succeeding while the churches are not succeeding financially in the open country without outside help. The County Work is succeeding in the country by taking advantage of a sufficiently large unit and financing their proposition on the basis of their service to the whole county, not on their appeal merely, but their service.

4. It is the only institution in the open country now that gives all the Kingdom's activities their proper religious significance. That is to say, a great many churches are organized on the plan that nothing is religious unless it goes on inside the building, while the Association is leading us to that broader definition of the Kingdom of God that every legitimate activity that is necessary to the health and happiness of folks ought to have a religious significance and is a part of the Kingdom; that organization is doing

this, so that the boys' work, rural health, rural cooperation in producing better crops, in picking out better seed corn, in raising better pumpkins, has in itself a religious significance. This is being done in the open country today by the Christian Associations. The churches ought to do the same.

Dr. Thomas.

We seem to have chiefly in mind the attempt to fix definitely the function of the rural church, as distinct from the function of the city church, and from that of the rural and town Young Men's Christian Association, and to define the relations between them. It seems to me that we have accomplished a good deal in merely establishing those distinctions in our minds. I think it is a matter of small concern as to which organization has the honor of initiating this distinction, and which has done more to bring it to the fore today. As a matter of fact that distinction exists in our minds now, and it did not exist only a few years ago. We are now differentiating between the country church and the church in the town, between religious work of such an organization as the Young Men's Christian Association in the city and

the work of the same organization in the country. I remember the stock argument for home missions in my church over in New Jersey a few years ago. It was that the Board of Home Missions organized the First Church of Kansas City, the First Church of Portland, Oregon, etc. They have since become large metropolitan churches in their communities. We were urged to give to the little home missionary churches all over the country in the expectation that they in turn would become large self-sustaining metropolitan churches. We accepted the plea and did not figure out the poor mathematics of the argument. We now see that a large proportion of these churches are destined to remain small, and, measured by the strength of their organization and their work, comparatively feeble. We are now making the distinction between a small church in a promising center, likely to grow, and a small church in the open country, likely to remain small.

Now in doing that, we have done one or two things that I would like to point out. We have removed a cause of terrible misjudgment of a large number of the most worthy, devout men who are serving the cause of Christ in the United States. Men

have judged themselves by this standard: "How many members have I added to my roll? How much has my church given the past year?" The same standards have been applied to the country churches as were applied, and perhaps fairly, to city churches. But they are not fair to the country minister. Hence many truly successful men in small rural parishes have condemned themselves, have suffered under the self-accusation of failure, because they have been measuring themselves by city standards, whereas if we had had this differentiation in mind, as we have today, a different standard would have prevailed.

This same differentiation has made clear the necessity of a different training in the education of country ministers. That, I am sure, is a subject that needs no enforcement. It has also made it clear that some time in the near future there must be a plan for the covering of the entire country with religious effort. There has never been such a plan. Church extension has been left to chance and to denominational zeal. What the state has done in compulsory education, religious people must do in their voluntary effort in church extension—bring religious opportunity within

the reach of every last child in the mountains and prairies.

Through this differentiation there has also come about an understanding of the mission of the church in the country, not to work for itself, but for the community. Its community function has become clear. On this point we have received a good deal of light today. I think when we receive these proceedings and read the paper of President Butterfield, we will find that a good deal has been said to clarify thought and make rural church work definite and practical, and, therefore, successful. For the most part, I am disposed to agree with him. The function of the church in the country is not to teach farming. That can be taught better elsewhere. It is not to help organize the business of the country. Its function is in the spiritual and in the personal realm, and it will accomplish its function as it confines itself definitely and particularly to that realm. I am not denying what I said before as to the community service of the country church, but I insist that church community service must be service which the church ought to render, not effort which is alien to its genius.

A good many years ago there was

preached in Peacham, Vermont, by Rev. David Merrill, a celebrated sermon entitled The Ox Sermon. The text was from Exodus—"If an ox gore a man or woman that they die, the ox shall be surely stoned, but the owner of the ox shall be quit. But if the ox were wont to push with his horn in time past, and it hath been testified to the owner, and he hath not kept him in, but that he hath killed a man or woman, the ox shall be stoned, and his owner also shall be put to death." From this unique text Mr. Merrill drew the principle of responsibility for one's deeds, responsibility even for consequences of careless acts. The first five minutes were used in drawing out this principle and enforcing it with illustrations far removed from Peacham, Vermont, but at the end of that time he came straight home to his congregation, among whom were men who sold liquor as they sold flour and sugar, and others who distilled it freely on their farms, and launched against them one of the most terrible temperance arraignments ever rendered. The sermon had a circulation as a tract of over 2,000,000 copies.

David Merrill was not teaching farming, but was working at the social ideals

and social evils of a farming people in terms which those people understood. We are not training men for that today. We teach them so that they can talk about Paul and Isaiah, but we are not training them to get at the problems of the spiritual, moral and social life of the people who live in the country in terms that country people understand and feel the force of. Let us keep to that mission, and the country church will come again to its power.

Rev. Charles Otis Gill.

A word may be needed to supplement what has already been said. A centipede was running along one day, making excellent progress, when a mischievous frog inquired of him which leg moved before which. The last time that centipede was heard from he was lying perplexed in the ditch considering how to run. This may have an application to the present situation. Apparently organizations are not now interfering with each other in work to hold a prosperous and happy people in the country. The needs in rural localities are so great, and the area so extensive, and the number of people working for the solution of our problem so small, that at

the present time the person or organization at hand would better be active in meeting the needs or in learning how to meet them. Readjustment and reassignment of duties to persons and organizations doubtless will come later. Today the Young Men's Christian Association in my county is holding a big State Corn Show. This Corn Show has transformed the work of more than one farmer from drudgery into an interesting occupation. It has been used in connection with other work of the Young Men's Christian Association as a means of moral and religious betterment of boys in the county. One might inquire why an organization should step so far out of its realm. But it is better not to discourage the Young Men's Christian Association from continuing this work. The time for it to stop is when some other organization, we will say the proper organization, is ready to take it up. When that time comes doubtless the Association will be ready to withdraw in order to do some other form of social service which is then needed.

As to the country church, I have very little fear of its doing work which does not come within the sphere of its proper function.

Under present conditions I would be very cautious about limiting the scope of its action or denying it the privilege of almost any form of social service. The ideal rural church is the entire community doing the will of God. There is very little danger of trespassing on anybody's occupation or interfering with any organization in the performance of its duty. An efficient church in a one church community will have its interests so intermingled with those of the community, and these will be so identical with those of the community, that there is very little to be feared in this respect. The country church should be encouraged rather than restricted in the rendering of social service. We accept as the first law of conduct that a man should love his neighbor as himself. Our faith accepts the idea that God is Father and that His love consists at least in a desire to bring every person to his highest possible development, while we believe that we are privileged to share this desire. It is the business of the church to give it practical expression, to clothe it in deeds and make possible its fruitage. In the country this must include better agriculture and the giving of opportunity to boys and girls to become straight and strong

and graceful. It means better schools. The church should help to change the sentiment of the community, fostering in it the same motive. One of the speakers has just remarked that the Young Men's Christian Association is in advance of the rest of the church because of its selection of the best men of the church to constitute its directing committees. Under such conditions there is, therefore, an obligation of the Association to lead the church in the performance of such social services as are most needed by the community. Consider, for example, the question of business cooperation. Without better business in the country its institutions cannot be properly sustained. It is important that the Association and all who are engaged in rural social service join in an educational propaganda relating to this particular thing. Cooperation makes a more thorough application of Christianity to business than any other known economic system. It is business organized on a democratic basis. More than half a century of experience in Europe has demonstrated that in rural business brotherhood is the best policy. The Young Men's Christian Association, because it is so well organized for engaging in this form of ser-

vice, should take its part in the development of a rural civilization in which the principles of Christian ethics and brotherhood are observed in business as well as in the other social relations of life. The Association should also do what it can to assist in the federation of the country churches.

Rev. S. P. Cook.

The Massachusetts Home Missionary Society has not only recognized the great value of the ideals and methods of the Young Men's Christian Association, working among the rural churches; it has also actively and officially cooperated with the County Association workers.

Secretary Warren H. Wilson has spoken a timely and judicious word for the rural church, emphasizing the importance of giving it all possible recognition and consideration, although it may have fallen on evil days, and sometimes fails seriously to fill its high mission of spiritual and social leadership.

A similar word may be timely for the rural pastor. He is likely to be somewhat painfully aware of the infelicities and the unfavorable elements of his field. He may also have a sense of personal inadequacy.

Not infrequently, he is burdened with the consciousness that he has been unable to furnish himself as completely for his work as many of his brethren. He may sometimes recall with a special and personal application the familiar lines:

> Oh, it is hard to work for God,
> To stand and take his part
> Upon the battlefield of life,
> And not sometimes lose heart.

For him, however, the line might read:

> And not *ofttimes* lose heart.

The Young Men's Christian Association secretary is usually a young man in the prime of early enthusiasm. He is adequately trained, a specialist, an expert—well supported financially and socially. He is always in the atmosphere of the best and most hopeful doings. He ministers to the young people—the very choice of the flock.

Quite otherwise is it with the rural pastor. He deals not so much with gathering increments, as with wasting residues. The normal atmosphere of the community which he serves has little of the bracing vigor of hope. He has much to do with shrunken households. He sees many aged people, sick and dying

in loneliness, bereft of children who have gone out and left their homes desolate. These, and other impoverished residues of former cheerful and generous social conditions are a great and preponderating part of the rural pastor's daily environment. He is often bidding Godspeed to valuable departing helpers; but few are they whom he can welcome as coming to live with him and to "strengthen his hand in God."

The helper who comes to him from the Young Men's Christian Association can take careful note of these conditions. He can come to the side of the pastor with appreciative sympathy. He can value him "very highly in love for his work's sake" and for his personal worth as well. There is very much of patient devotion, of self-sacrifice, of faithfulness in that "which is least" as men count in the rural field.

We gladly look as far as Labrador, and beyond, to see such things, but we need not look so far.

Blessed are they who serve thus in weariness and painfulness, often poorly appreciated and slightly requited, and blessed are they who go to them, and, even partially and

for a time, come under the burden with them as "brethren of the common lot."

Hon. Gifford Pinchot.

I did not come here today to talk, I came to listen to those who have done the work. But I am glad now that I have this chance to express my very strong conviction that whether it is to be done by the Young Men's Christian Association, or whether it is done by the church, or whether it is done by the two together—the great task that faces us here in the United States, the fundamental task, far more important than the city task, is the redemption and redirection of the work and the life in the open country.

Not, mind you, the open country as it is understood by the United States census, which includes all towns of less than 2,500, but the open country where the man lives on the land and makes his living out of the land. That has always been from the beginning the source of strength of every nation, and it is the source of our strength.

In the work of redeeming that life I agree most heartily with what Mr. Gill has just said. In that work an essential and inevitable part is to change the competitive point

of view. When you are competing with a man in business, at least if the experience of this country is any indication, it is pretty hard to carry out toward him the Golden Rule. If you are trying to get something away from him that he is trying to get away from you, it is pretty hard to love him as yourself. But through the methods of cooperation, which Mr. Gill has just called a practical application of Christianity to business, you can, as I see it, use the point of view of the Master in all business matters.

There is no need, as I take it, for an argument for cooperation, an argument for organization, for the getting together of men of the country. It has been well stated here today and is familiar to you. The man who is not organized is the necessary prey of the man who is organized.

We cannot redeem the country, as I see it, by the application merely of spiritual or intellectual methods. There can be no satisfactory spiritual or intellectual life as things are now organized—it might have been so years ago—unless we have also a satisfactory material basis. It is our business to organize things in the country so that equality of opportunity shall bring to the average man

and woman the chance for the kind of personal development we all hope for. As I see it, the business of religious organizations is to give men and women a chance to lead organized, religious lives. Therefore we cannot avoid, in our religious organizations, going straight to the economic question and the economic motive and making the church the leader in the economic redemption of the country, just exactly as it must be in its spiritual redemption.

Dr. Carver.

I was very much impressed with Dr. Butterfield's address. What I say may seem like an anti-climax, but may also possibly add something to it. We all believe, of course, in religious work, Christian work. We all sing, "Work for the night is coming." It seems to me if we could make that a little more pointed and instead of saying "Work"—everybody wants to work, but does not know what to do first—say, "Clean out these fence corners, for the night is coming," "Build better bridges and schoolhouses for the night is coming"; we would get somewhere. Work may mean anything or nothing and many of us have an idea that

Christian work consists in going out and getting other people to join our Association or church. What are they joining for? In order to get other people to join. At least it has sometimes seemed that way. It is like certain of our college fraternities. They exist absolutely for the purpose of initiating members.

I believe there is a certain old saying about losing your life and saving it. That may not be true of the individual life. I have some doubts about that because the laws of biology come in there. But I am sure it is true of institutional life. I believe that the institution whose sole purpose is to keep its life, spends all of its energy in keeping itself going and adding to its own life, ought to die, and in the logical universe must die. There is no mystery or magic about that. The laws of nature will bring it about. But an institution that forgets that it has a life of its own to prolong, which spends no energy on that, but gives its energy to building the community—such an institution ought not to die and in a logical universe cannot die. The community will not allow it to die. Improving the bridges, roads, and the public health and agricultural production so that every time

there is a religious revival you can detect its course by the decreased death rate or the increased corn crop will justify the existence of any religious organization. An institution promoting such a religion as that cannot die. At least we have scriptural warrant for believing that. My sole exhortation, therefore, is to get behind this work of rural organization; not organization in air, not organization for organization sake, not mere leadership for leadership sake; but organization for a specific purpose. That is the way leadership comes. The divinely called, the divinely ordained leader is one who knows what to do and how to do it. There is no mystery or magic about leadership. A body of scientists out in the woods gets lost. They have a knowledge of things in general, but do not know the way. A man comes along who knows the way out. He is a divinely ordained leader of that bunch at that time. That is all there is to leadership—the man who knows in the exigencies of time and place the thing to do and how to do it. Study the specific problem of your own community—not how we can have organization, but what kind of an organization will get this or that specific thing done.

Dr. Butterfield.

I want to express a qualification and a prejudice. The qualification is this: I sympathize absolutely (and I do not want the county secretaries to think I do not) with the idea of actually doing the things that need to be done. The work that was mentioned this afternoon, that splendid corn show in Vermont, held under the auspices of the Young Men's Christian Association, is legitimate and highly valuable. But I think we might say that there are two philosophies of social effort. Some men hold both, and some only one. There is the philosophy of "Johnny-on-the-spot," and there is the philosophy of "the-long-look-ahead." I think the philosophy of "Johnny-on-the-spot" is a very fine thing. Oftentimes the county secretary, for example, is the man "on the job" who can best get things done. He does and should do the things that need doing.

My slight prejudice consists in this: I cannot at all agree with the statement that it does not make any difference how we divide up rural tasks. We are in a perfectly chaotic condition today with regard to the organization of our agriculture and country life needs;

but, unless I mistake the signs of the times, during the next few years we must make decisions in hundreds of rural communities, in many counties, in some states, and perhaps in the nation at large, as to the general method by which agriculture and country life may be organized. We may make irreparable blunders. We must, for instance, decide at once upon the voluntary organization that is going to give national leadership to the question of business cooperation; we can make an egregious mistake if we are not careful.

Therefore, while the great need is to get the rural work done, to stir the waters, and to stimulate country people and natural country leaders to see the great things and to do them—actually do them today and tomorrow, and not to wait for a paper-made scheme from the college professor—we must also adopt the philosophy of "the-long-look-ahead." There is nothing more important than that we who are supposed to be thinking out these things, shall think them through in terms of fundamental functions. Let me also call your attention to the fact that the "Johnny-on-the-spot" philosophy may be a two-edged sword. If the county secretary can

do all things, no matter how many other agencies there are available though not at work, the reverse is true. I know a county where today the secretary of a certain organization is proposing to do the work that the Young Men's Christian Association should do. In other words, "Johnny-on-the-spot" may just as well exclude the Young Men's Christian Association as include it. I urge then, with great earnestness, that we all try to adhere also to "the-long-look-ahead" philosophy.

DELEGATES TO THE COUNTRY CHURCH CONFERENCE, NOVEMBER 6, 1913.

AUGUSTINE, REV. R. H. M. Hanover Presbyterian Church, N. J.
AUGUSTINE, MRS. R. H. M.
BEAVER, GILBERT. Student Department International Committee.
BOARDMAN, JOHN R. Good Will Farm.
BORTON, J. HARVEY. Burlington County, N. J., Committee.
BOYD, F. H. Orange County, N. Y., Young Men's Christian Associations.
BRUNNER, REV. EDMUND DE S. Moravian Country Church Commission.
BUCHMAN, FRANK N. D. Pennsylvania State College.
BUTTERFIELD, KENYON L. President Massachusetts Agricultural College.
CARVER, DR. T. N. United States Department of Agriculture.
COOK, EDGAR L.
COOK, REV. S. P. Massachusetts Home Missionary Society.
COXHEAD, GEORGE T.
DILLARD, JAMES HARDY. The Jeanes Fund and John F. Slater Fund.
DRURY, L. LORIMER. Mount Hermon School.
EDWARDS, RICHARD H. Student Department International Committee.
FARLEY, D. V. Orange County, N. Y., Young Men's Christian Associations.
GILL, REV. CHARLES OTIS. Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.
GLENN, JOHN M. Russell Sage Foundation.
GOODNOW, C. W.
GRANGER, DR. W. A. Baptist State Convention.
GRIFFIN, M. W.
HALL, DR. BOLTON.
HANMER, LEE F. Russell Sage Foundation.
HARDING, C. L. Interstate Young Men's Christian Association of Maryland, Delaware, District of Columbia and West Virginia.
HARPER, R. O.
HARRIS, REV. FRANK P.
HARTE, A. C. Foreign Department International Committee.
HERRING, REV. HERBERT C., D. D. Congregational Home Mission Society.
HOSMER, C. F. York County, Maine, Young Men's Christian Associations.
HOWARD, JOHN R., JR. Thomas Thompson Trust.
HURD, PROF. WM. D. Massachusetts Agricultural College.
HUSTED, CHESTER. Dutchess County, N. Y., Committee.
KIDDER, F. THOMAS. Windsor County, Vermont, Young Men's Christian Associations.

LANGDON, WILLIAM CHAUNCY. Russell Sage Foundation.
LUND, MRS. HAVILAND. National Forward to the Land League.
MANN, A. R. New York State College of Agriculture.
MILLIKEN, C. E. Maine State Committee.
MOFFATT, S. A. Boy Scouts of America.
MONAHAN, HON. ARTHUR C. United States Bureau of Education.
MORGAN, O. S. State Executive Committee County Work.
MOSSMAN, W. B.
OLAUDT, REV. CLAUS. Westchester County, Hudson River Section.
PINCHOT, HON. GIFFORD.
PINCUS, J. S. Federation of Jewish Farmers.
POWELL, GEORGE T.
REED, REV. ROBERT. Pennsylvania State College.
RICH, REV. C. C. Westchester County, Hudson River Section.
RILEY, ARMIN W.
ROBBIE, K. Young Men's Christian Association, Springfield, Massachusetts.
ROBINSON, LEONARD G. Jewish Agricultural Society.
RUSSELL, J. M. New Hampshire State Committee.
SANDERS, FRANK K. President Washburn College.
SANDERSON, E. D. West Virginia University College of Agriculture.
SHAW, H. A.
STONE, HERBERT S. Franklin County, Massachusetts.
TAFT, MISS ANNA B. Presbyterian Department Church and Country Life.
THOMAS, J. M. President Middlebury College.
VAN ALSTYNE, EDWARD. Farmers' Institute Department of Agriculture.
VAN VALKENBURGH, CYRUS W.
WALK, GEORGE E. New York University, Pedagogy Professor.
WATSON, HARRY BATES. New Hampshire State Committee.
WEST, JAMES E. Boy Scouts of America.
WHEELER, R. W. Playground and Recreation Association of America.
WILSON, WARREN H. Presbyterian Board of Home Missions, Department of Church and Country Life.

Theological Seminaries

ALLISON, DR. WM. H. Colgate Theological Seminary.
BOYNTON, DR. C. H. General Theological Seminary, New York.
EARP, PROF. EDWIN L. Drew Theological Seminary, Department of Sociology.
FISKE, PROF. G. WALTER. Oberlin Theological Seminary.
FISMER, A. W. Ph. D. German Theological Seminary.
KEAGY, R. C. Drew Theological Seminary.
McADAMS, SAMUEL. Drew Theological Seminary.
SNEATH, PROF. E. HERSHEY. Yale Divinity School.
WOOD, PROF. JOHN A. Bible Teachers' Training School, New York City.

County Work Delegates

ACKLEY, S. A. Virginia State Committee.
BAXLEY, W. H. County Work Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association of Westchester County, N. Y.
CAMPBELL, W. J. State County Secretary of Pennsylvania.
COBURN, C. A. State Secretary of New Jersey.
CONVERSE, HAROLD B. County Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association of Greene County, N. Y.
DREW, D. C. State County Secretary of Massachusetts.
ELLINWOOD, C. H. County Work Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association of Barnstable County, Mass.
FOSTER, P. A. County Work Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association of Sullivan County, N. H.
FREEMAN, F. B. State County Secretary of New Hampshire.
GAMMONS, C. A. Assistant County Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association of Westchester County, N. Y.
GRUBBS, NORMAN S. Assistant County Work Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association of Burlington County, N. J.
HEALD, A. A. State County Secretary of Maine.
HILL, F. M. State County Secretary of New York.
ISRAEL, HENRY. County Work Department International Committee.
JUDD, E. TAYLOR. County Work Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association of Monmouth County, N. J.
LORENTZ, D. E. County Work Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association of Morris County, N. J.
MAYDOLE, H. D. County Work Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association of Camden County, N. J.
PIPHER, C. H. County Work Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association of Berkshire County, Mass.
READ, OTIS B. County Work Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association of Burlington County, N. J.
ROBERTS, ALTON C. County Work Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association of Carroll County, N. H.
ROBERTS, ALFRED E. County Work Department, International Committee.
SMITH, HARRY HEDLEY. County Work Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association of Gloucester County, N. J.
SMITH, J. C. State Secretary of Maine.
STETSON, C. W. Assistant County Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association of Westchester County, N. Y.
TREMPER, BENJAMIN. County Work Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association of Dutchess County, N. Y.
WILCOX, Z. L. County Work Secretary, Young Men's Christian Association of Orange County, N. Y.

Young Women's Christian Association

HOLMQUIST, MISS LOUISE. National Board.
SEABURG, MISS ANNA. National Board.
THOMAS, MISS HELEN L. Educational Department, National Board.
WILSON, MISS ELIZABETH. National Board.
WILSON, MRS. WARREN H. National Board.

A NEW VISION

for rural church and community is given in these practical books

COUNTRY CHURCH AND RURAL WELFARE
Cloth, $1.00

The wide range of problems confronting the rural church, and the variety of subjects involved in the whole question of community betterment, make these papers by men of long experience along agricultural, educational and pastoral lines peculiarly valuable.

RURAL CHURCH AND COMMUNITY BETTERMENT
Cloth, $1.00

A discussion by acknowledged leaders of the various ways of bringing the best influences to bear on rural communities. President Butterfield, of Massachusetts Agricultural College; Prof. Fiske of Oberlin; Dr. Warren H. Wilson of the Presbyterian Board, and others deal with the questions involved.

COUNTRY CHURCH AND COMMUNITY CO-OPERATION
Cloth, $1.00

The fruitful results of a careful investigation made by a specially appointed commission, whose chairman was Professor T. N. Carver of Harvard, and whose personnel included men who have done big things in improving rural conditions.

ASSOCIATION PRESS

124 EAST 28TH STREET - - NEW YORK

LOS ANGELES
STATE NORMAL SCHOOL

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
THIS BOOK CARD

THE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LOS ANGELES

University Research Library

BV1210 185U

CALL NUMBER

SER VOL PT COP

AUTHOR

FORM L30202